DOCUMENT RESUME

HE 000 117

ED 024 339

By- Graham, D. Robert

State Legislatures, State Universities and Self Preservation.

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 12 Nov 68
Note- 7p.; Paper presented to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C., November 12, 1968.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.45
Descriptors- *Financial Needs, *Higher Education, *Legislation, Minority Groups, Policy, Special Programs, *State Aid, State Curriculum Guides, *State Universities

The changing relationship between state legislatures and universities is cause for concern. State governments are aware of their fading influence on universities and are making increasingly critical assessments of their educational programs. Their contributions to budgets of public colleges and universities increased between 1954 and 1964, but the percentage of the states' contributions to total budgets decreased from 44% to 38%. Before legislative reapportionment, politicians were largely influenced by rural state agricultural institutions. Today the college-educated legislators representing urban constituencies appreciate the budgetary needs of their alma maters, but they evaluate all government-funded operations, including the colleges and universities, in terms of objectives and performance. Indeed some of the student complaints against the university are justified and merit legislative consideration. In a survey of 215 colleges and universities (50% were public) on compensatory programs for low income and minority groups, 60% of the responding public institutions had no programs. One midwestern university enrolled only 2% of an over 20% eligible black population. Universities should concentrate on self-evaluation, rational long-range planning, and acceptance of higher education as a comprehensive system. Expanded benefits to society can then be provided through state capital-campus cooperation and profit both. (WM)

ED 024339

STATE LEGISLATURES, STATE UNIVERSITIES AND SELF PRESERVATION

Representative D. Robert Graham
Florida House of Representatives

Council of Presidents of the

National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
November 12, 1968
Washington, D. C.

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HE 000 117

STATE LEGISLATURES, STATE UNIVERSITIES AND SELF PRESERVATION

Representative D. Robert Graham
Florida House of Representatives

Council of Presidents of the
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
November 12, 1968
Washington, D.C.

President Gross extended your kind invitation to speak this evening while I was in New York City. When I began to consider a theme that might be presented to the Council of Presidents by a state legislator, I was influenced by the sympathy which I feel for university presidents. There are few positions in our tumultuous society which have been so rocked by contemporary events. I assume that this has taken its toll in terms of presidents who attended this banquet last year and are not with us this evening.

This attitude was about to prompt me to make a speech of compassion when I read the morning issue of the New York Times. There, the latest distress of Mayor John Lindsey was detailed: Over one million school children found their classrooms locked for the third consecutive week; twenty percent of the police department had caught the "Hong Kong Flu;" other uniformed public employees appeared to be highly susceptible to the strangely contagious disease; and, Governor Rockefeller had just completed a tour of the New York harbor and told the Mayor that the piers were falling into the sea. My natural empathy for a fellow politician sustained and steeled me for my comments tonight.

After further consideration, it seemed that instead of the survival of presidents, it seemed more appropriate for a state legislator to discuss the politics of survival of state legislatures and state universities. The politics of survival has achieved a new urgency due to the changing relationship of state government - particularly state legislatures - and public higher education.

An examination of this relationship is particularly vital at this time. As you are well aware, the federal government currently is re-evaluating its financial commitment to support higher education construction and research programs. President-elect Richard Nixon has expressed the belief that the federal government has paid undue attention to higher education, and that these efforts in support of public institutions have threatened to drive private higher education out of existence.

The continued decline of federal support is particularly crucial as it comes at the end of a decade in which state government's percentage of contributions to public higher education has been diminishing. While during the ten years from 1954 to 1964 the amounts contributed by the states to the budgets of public colleges and universities has increased, ~~(the percentage of the total of these budgets contributed by the states to the budgets of public colleges and universities has increased,)~~ the percentage of the total of these budgets contributed by the states has fallen from 44 percent to 38 percent. The federal government and the student have been shouldering the added cost.

This concern for the capital-campus relationship is also timely at the beginning of a new decade which could determine the continued existence of our federal system. For more than half a century, states have witnessed the decline of their influence

on substantial social and economic issues. This deterioration of position has been excused in the past with the cry of mal-apportioned government which was institutionally incapable of relating to contemporary problems. This convenient excuse now has been removed, and it will soon be determined whether the states' past failures have been cosmetic or congenital.

In searching for a statement of the challenge facing legislatures in dealing with universities, the following formulation was provided by Harvard's President Emeritus, James B. Conant:

> "Granted that the ultimate power is in the hands of the legislature and that the legislature must act each session on matters of finance, the basic question is how can the legislature create and supervise a structure which will insure the improvement of education at all levels?"

Although this provides a satisfactory statement of the challenge, President Conant's formula leaves the basic issues for further delineation. He dismisses with a casual assumption the fact that the legislature acts on financial questions. Particularly in states where public higher education has failed to develop a comprehensive planning process, the decisions which the legislature makes on budgetary matters often are the most educationally significant made by any policy body in the state.

The nature of legislative supervision can run a broad spectrum from Olympian oversight to administrative nit picking. If in the past, legislators have demonstrated a propensity to engage in trivia. The cultivation and care of appropriate and significant legislative supervision would appear to be a matter of considerable concern to every university administration.

Accepting the Conant formula as the basis of this relationship, there currently have emerged a number of significant factors affecting the substance of this relationship. I would like to touch on three of these emerging factors and turn to some of the responses which these factors will elicit.

The first factor is the emergence of the university as a major social force. At the end of the nineteenth centure, an Oxford guide could still state:

> "Occasionally you will find among England's captains of industry one who has been at the University, and he will be proud of and have profited by his connection. But, as a rule, the wealthy manufacturer does not send his son to Oxford. It is most unfortunate that the University has the reputation of unfitting a man for practical life, but it is deserved at least in part."

The university as monastry is now in a shambles. Jacques Barzun commented on the extent of this reversal:

> "Through its individual members as well as through its official undertakings, it has come to take a direct part in the work of government, industry, and foreign affairs. Because of the rising population and its rising demands for higher education, because of the lengthening and thickening of professional training, the university, public or private, has taken on the task of fitting the ambitions of young and old to the needs of the day, these needs being defined in worldly terms. Higher

> education is now supposed to lead direct into practical life. In a word, the university is now a place for making precision instruments, and both the institution and the world keep telling each other that the future of the country depends on such production being maintained."

Second, the states are facing increasing financial burdens, both in terms of the rising cost of traditional state activities as well as the assumption of new responsibilities. States are just beginning to realize the enormous financial impact of implementing an equal education program in the primary and secondary grades for those large numbers of students who are the product of culturally and economically disadvantaged backgrounds. Another major new program of state government is medical assistance to the indigent and elderly. Even in those states which have entered into Medicaid with caution, it is likely that this new program will represent up to 5 percent of current general revenue. This increased pressure on states' limited resources has produced greater legislative scrutiny of all activities, including higher education.

The third force is legislative reapportionment. Some political scientists have discounted the early enthusiasm for reapportionment, contending that new faces will represent the same vested interests. I can accept that reapportionment will produce a variety of effects, depending upon the peculiar political circumstances of the individual state and the extent of prior mal-apportionment. However, there are some which appear to have general application.

Reapportionment has tended to bring into state legislatures a group of men who are better educated and, therefore, would be assumed to be more attuned to the problems of higher education. For instance, in Florida, in 1957 only half of the members of the state legislature were college graduates. At the 1967 session, the first after full scale reapportionment, over 75 percent of the members held at least one college degree. There is a real irony here. While this increase in the exposure of members of the legislature to you and your sister institutions should increase the legislators' appreciation for the needs of higher education, it has also contributed to their increased capacity for critical analysis of public higher education.

For those of you who represent the traditional major institutions, within the state, reapportionment may result in a change in your relationship with the legislature. Your alumni legislator is likely to reflect less institutional commitment as a divergence occurs between his political constituency and his alma mater. Prior to reapportionment, when rural domination of the legislature was common, the major state university, with its heavy concentration on agricultural activities, may have enjoyed a preferred position before the appropriation committee. Today, with the legislature representing urban constituencies, often gographically distant from the state university, the football weekend approach to budgetary persuasion will be less productive.

A final effect of reapportionment is the legislature's responsiveness to new political forces. These new political constituencies will inevitably shape the legislature's attitude toward state activities.

Dr. Harold Taylor in his soon to be published book with the seditious title Students Without Teachers, developes the thesis that a primary source of the land grant institutions' vitality has been their adaptability to new constituencies: agriculture, and, more recently, industry. The emerging constituency for your

institutions, Taylor prophesizes, will be your students; students demanding a greater appreciation of their rights in the classroom and society.

This is particularly true of the undergraduate, and their concerns are being communicated. While President of the University of California, Clark Kerr observed:

> "Only in the older, private universities has the quality of undergraduate instruction been an important continuing criterion--this partly through the strong influence of the alumni. Now there is a greater interest among the public generally and within legislatures in particular in the quality of undergraduate teaching. The public universities will respond to the stimulus of this interest as the private universities have to their alumni."

As a politician, these demands are persuasive and politically potent. In my role as legislator - ombudsman, the complaints of students against the university are generally mature, significant and justified. With half the population soon to be under twenty-five and the political alumen demonstrated by college students during the recent presidential campaign, these complaints are receiving attentive consideration by the politician, and, I trust, by you.

Another political constituency of particular interest to the university will be Black America. The record of all too many state universities in terms of affirmatively striving to meet the higher educational needs of disadvantaged youths has been uninspired.

A survey, dated April, 1968, by the Southern Education Foundation, reported the result of an inquiry to predominately white, four year institutions on what those institutions were doing to make higher education available to low income and minority group students with the qualities, but not the credentials, for college success. Two hundred fifteen colleges and universities, half public, were questioned. Sixty percent of the responding public institutions indicated no program, and among the fifty major state universities, most land grant institutions, seventy-five percent, indicated no activity directed toward this group of students had been implemented.

This response seems to give validity to the observation of a leading national educator, identified with higher education programs for the disadvantaged when he described the academic administrators' concept of the university as a "passive hurdle": an institution which is available for the student to scale, but which has no responsibility or emotional commitment to provide an additional push.

The recent experiences of some of the most distinguished educational institutions in effectively providing compensatory programs, without a dimunition of academic standards, has stripped away the purists excuses for inaction. The Southern Education Foundation has specifically applauded programs in a number of your institutions including: the University of Wisconsin, the University of California, Michigan State University and the University of Michigan, the University of Oregon, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and Southern Illinois University. The Foundation indicated the existence of similar programs at other of your institutions, which programs were not included in the survey.

Affirmatively, it has been suggested that state universities, from their long experience with open and semi-open enrollments and history of developing successful programs for other groups of educationally disadvantaged, foreign students,

athletes, veterans, are uniquely suited to pioneer these efforts. With their large responsibilities for the training of public school teachers and administrators, the state university has an inescapable obligation and opportunity for the standard of pre-collegiate education in the state.

Politically, the continued gapping discrepancy between black population and enrollment figures is untenable. One midwestern state has in excess of twenty percent black population, yet only two percent of the state university enrollment is black. With limited state resources, and the allocating legislature responsive to people, if I were that university's administrator, I would find it in my self interest to join the mainstream.

The substantive effects of the increasing recognition of relevance, limitations of resources, and new politics are beginning to appear. Four of these effects seem to be particularly significant.

First, the university will be judged by standards more critical and probing than ever before. These standards will relate universities to other governmental activities by focusing on an evaluation of the output of the university system, rather than line items of input. The common denominator for all evaluation will be the contribution of each program at the margin. I view this development with great enthusiasm, fully cognizant of its difficulties.

The output orientation provides a corollary to President Conant's assumption that the legislature must act on matters of finance: The political decision maker should establish the goals of public higher education within the frame work of total societal goals; the academic community should develop programs to attain these goals and a procedure to evaluate accomplishment; and, the political decision makers should apply this evaluation to the prescribed goals. It is the appropriate role in a democracy for the political decision makers to articulate, in some specific terms, what they expect from the state university system. This is not to imply that political judgments are made without a full opportunity for the universities to participate in the development of these goals; but it does underscore that the ultimate responsibility lies in the political process. With the goals established, the university then assumes its proper academic and professional function in developing programs to discharge these responsibilities. The legislature's supervision becomes a continuous evaluation of the extent to which the university programs are fulfilling its objectives.

In another regard, the output orientation is significant for universities, because the universities are not the only agency in state government to which such analysis is being applied. Legislators will look at all government functions in terms of objective and performance. To the extent that a state governmental function, whether it's a community mental health center or a state university, can develop sophisticated and persuasive evaluation techniques, that activity is likely to receive a favored position at the budget table. At this point the university should be at an advantage, with its ability to call on its own brain power for self analysis.

Second, the new order will place an accelerated emphasis on rational, long range planning. I emphasize the rationality of the planning.

In all too many instances, the verbose ratification of the status quo has substituted for a long term plan. Some educators have voiced the opinion that

long range planning is an exercise in futility since the politician with adequate power will abort the plan when it comes in conflict with his desires. I think this is unduly pessimistic. In my evaluation, politicians as a group are characterized by a desire to avoid making decisions. The politician can elide, with impunity, his constituents' request for a higher education activity by difference to persuasive, strategic plan.

A third effect is the emergence of legislative concern that higher education be viewed as a comprehensive system rather than as a set of mutually independent institutions. The system approach is sometimes viewed with trepidation by state universities, often seen as a diverting of influence away from the traditionally dominant state institution. I think such an attitude is both professionally irregular, and politically naive.

In an era when faculty and students seemingly are less institutionally oriented, it would seem intellectually indefensible for administrators to place excessive emphasis on institutional roles. Politically, in a period of a rising tide of students, as well as new emphasis, and spiraling expenditures on higher education, this would appear to be the opportune time in which a system approach could be adopted and cause the least dislocation to the traditional institutions. In all candor, however, I will have to say that I think the adoption of the system approach mandates a consistent, if not lock step comparable, treatment of the components of the system. The extent to which existing programs are achieving educational objectives should be reviewed with the same vigor as proposals for the establishment of new programs.

Finally, the intrinsically symbiotic relationship between state governments and state universities should produce expanded benefits for society. The states are in their most critical period in terms of ultimate survival. The extent to which the states can bring creative, effective solutions to the problems of transportation, pollution, racial harmony, and development of our human resources will determine their continued existence. The state universities represent one of the major resources available to state government in meeting these challenges. Thus, when state government insures a relevant and effective state university, it is insuring its own self preservation.

Thank you.

- - - - -